10-1946

St. Cloud State Teachers College Bulletin (Volume 3, Number 1)

St. Cloud State University

St. Cloud State Teachers College

BULLETIN

TRENDS OF THE NEW AGE

VOLUME 3 OCTOBER 1946 NUMBER 1

Published by The State Teachers College, St. Cloud, Minnesota. Issued four times a year in the months of January, April, May, and October. Entered as second class matter July 21, 1944 at the post office at St. Cloud, Minnesota under the act of August 24, 1912.

FOREWORD

Man's climb from savagery to his present condition is the result of his use of the natural resources of the earth, his biological heredity, and the cultural cumulation of past generations. The first, the resources of environment, are the natural resources or the resources of place. They include such things as climate, relief of land, soil, water, minerals, plants and animals. The second, the resources of human biology, include the physical and mental equipment of man—his physique, method of carriage, and prehensile thumb, the color of skin, the absence of fur and the development of senses and intelligence. The third, resources of culture, are the resources of our civilization—social factors—scientific achievements, inventions, governments, religious and economic groups.

These are interrelated. Resources of environment make possible, in a large measure, the resources of culture and to a less degree the resources of human biology. The resources of environment can be and are modified by the resources of human biology and human culture. Mountains can be moved, streams diverted, food preserved from decay, climate modified, (air conditioning), night turned into day (artificial illumination), tropic heat brought to arctic realms, and arctic cold to the tropics.

Civilization is the product of the environment in which man lives modified by physical and social forces.

Man's happiness depends upon his ability to keep the three—physical environment, human biology, and culture, in balance. At the present time man's scientific knowledge and his inventions are ahead of his governmental, religious, and economic culture. Confusion results, and will continue to be present until such time as a balance is reached. The schools of America must assume a large share of the responsibility for educating Americans so they will be able to solve the problems that confront them. Failure to solve these social problems may well result in losing the social and cultural gains so far achieved by man.

This BULLETIN is the first of two to be published by the Social Studies Division of the St. Cloud State Teachers College on the general theme: ACHIEVING A WORLD ORDER OF LAW AND PEACE. It is entitled TRENDS OF THE NEW AGE and attempts to set forth briefly some of the problems of today. The second BULLETIN will attempt to indicate the manner in which the social studies teachers in our schools can prepare students to solve the problems of their time. —F. E. Perkins.

This Bulletin is published by the Bureau of Field Service of the St. Cloud, Minnesota, State Teachers College, Floyd E. Perkins, Chairman, aided by a cooperating Bulletin Committee composed of:

Miss Amy Dale	English
Miss Elizabeth Barker	Health and Physical Education
Miss Ruth Moscrip	Laboratory Schools
Miss Myrl Carlsen	Music and Arts
Miss Audra Whitford	Business Education
Mr. John Cochrane	Social Studies
Mr. George Friedrich	Science and Mathematics
Mr. Floyd Perkins (Chairman)	Professional Studies

VITAL WORLD PROBLEMS

Leslie Day Zeleny

A new age crashed upon us in August, 1945, when one atomic bomb, product of science, destroyed a major portion of Hiroshima in a few minutes. Here it was demonstrated that mankind possessed a power so great that, properly placed, it could "liquidate" a great nation. This impelling fact, together with a world fast dividing itself into two huge social systems (with satellites) competing for domination, has made the most calloused pause to shudder at what could happen to the world were the two "haves" to wish for war more than for peace. There are, then, at least two vital problems of the world today: that of the use of atomic energy, and that of the rise of two competing social systems.

The terrific power of the atomic bomb, when fully understood, should be sufficient to shock all peoples of the world into a deep realization that future major wars will be short, leading to the destruction of a nation in a few minutes, for the annihilation of large cities simultaneously attacked by bombs powered with atomic energy could paralyze industrial life. Let us consider in detail the actual observed effects of the explosion of one atomic bomb. Scientists tell us that when detonated the effect of the atomic bomb is like that of a small piece of sun glowing at a temperature of about a hundred million degrees Fahrenheit; the terrific heat creates a sudden expansion, pushing away the air with a violence so great that a pressure of enormous proportions extending for many miles in distance is created. Then, rushing into the great "vacuum" thus created, surge "winds" of five hundred to one thousand miles per hour, destroying nearly everything before them.

Accompanying the destructive winds, there is a heat so intense that everything inflammable nearby bursts into flame. Added to this is a radiation which "burns" in a different way and causes the blood to ooze through unbroken skin and fill the internal body cavities, destroying infection-fighting white blood corpuscles. An awful death slowly follows.

When one atomic bomb drops on a city all houses and buildings in a large area (perhaps a mile in radius) are either totally destroyed or made completely useless; steel and concrete buildings are left a mass of rubble and twisted girders and are utterly destroyed on the inside by the winds and the heat. Medical units and hospitals are rendered ineffective as most of the buildings are wrecked and the personnel killed or wounded. Unchecked fires burn and destroy everywhere, and the police and military in the local area are eliminated as a potent force. Thus destruction is complete. These facts have been established by two verified demonstrations—the destruction of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.[1]

One does not need a vivid imagination to picture the fall of a nation within a few weeks after one bomb has hit each of its major cities. A

[1]For this and subsequent references, refer to bibliography at the end of this article.

great problem of the new age, then, is the use and control of atomic energy. Will it be used to destroy mankind or to make life easier for more people?

A second great problem of the world today is the uncertain outcome of the current intense struggle between the two great social systems of the world, the state capitalism of Soviet Russia and the democracy of the Western powers. Were the competition to lead to open conflict during the next generation, the major weapon would probably be the atomic bomb.

Actually the atomic bomb in itself is less dangerous for mankind than the intergroup attitudes generated in competition and incipient conflict.

Today, it appears that each of the two world blocks is determined to struggle to preserve and to expand what each believes to be the right way of life. There is an unprecedented competition in ideas. Stalin precipitated the competition anew in his recent election speech when he said:

> Now victory means, first of all, that our Soviet social system has won, that the Soviet Social system has successfully stood the test of the fire of war and has proved its complete vitality. . .
>
> The point is that the Soviet system has proved to be more capable of life and more stable than a non-soviet social system, that the Soviet social system is a better form of organization of society than any non-Soviet social system.[2]

This was an outright challenge to the rest of the world.

Fortunately for the democracies, there are strong champions who challenge the assertions of Stalin. Irving Fisher, Professor Emeritus of Political Economy at Yale University, took much of the power out of Stalin's assertions when he pointed out that Soviet Russia's success in the war was due in no small measure to the essential economic and military help provided by capitalistic America. The major function of the Persian Gulf Command, for example, was to keep a continual flow of supplies moving through Iran to Russia's Western Front to bolster the sagging lines. Again, according to Dr. Fisher, an important part of the foundation for the Soviet economic development was taught to the Russians by American experts in mass production.[3]

Moreover, Stalin's bold assertion failed to mention that Soviet Russia still has many unsolved problems: soldiers who do not want to go back to work on the farm; Esthonians, Latvians, Lithuanians, Tartars, who do not desire assimilation; thousands or millions of new war-hero party members who are hard to discipline; and well-traveled soldiers who, having seen evidence of the higher standards of living of Western countries, have wondered why the Soviet standards are so low. [4]

The claims of democracy have been vividly set up against those of state capitalism by Winston Churchill, who said in his speech at Fulton, Missouri:

> . . .we must never cease to proclaim in fearless tones the great principles of freedom and the rights of man, which are the joint inheritance of the English-speaking world and which, through the

> Magna Charta, the Bill of Rights, the habeas corpus, trial by jury and the English common law find their famous expression in the Declaration of Independence. . .
>
> But if the dangers of war and tyranny are removed, there is no doubt that science and cooperation can bring in the next few years to the world, newly taught in the hard school of war, an expansion of material well beyond anything that has yet occurred in human experience.[5]

And there are many who follow Churchill in his belief that it is in the freedom of mankind, not in regimentation, that the hope for the future lies.

In opposition to this view Stalin declared:

> . . .the capitalist system of world economy conceals elements of crisis and war, that the development of world capitalism does not follow a steady and even course forward, but proceeds through crises and catastrophes. The uneven development of the capitalist countries leads in time to sharp disturbances in their relations and the group of countries which consider themselves inadequately provided with raw materials and export markets try usually to change this situation and to change the position in their favor by means of armed force.[6]

Irving Fisher, however, in the article in which he emphatically denied that Russia's victory was any proof at all of the superiority of the Soviet economic system, reluctantly admitted that:

> . . .we have never yet had a dollar which has maintained its value in the sense of purchasing power even through a decade. Whenever we have inflation—that is the phase we are now entering—we have outcries over the high cost of living and an epidemic of strikes. And whenever we have deflation, we have hard times and unemployment. . .That system will always be in danger as long as business is not supplied with a stable unit of value.[7]

Thus, we have "propaganda" and "counter-propaganda," coming from the two major areas of the world, each dominated by a major country. And, each by necessity endeavors to "sell" the "common man" everywhere the idea or belief that the system under which he now lives is the best, and to undermine, if possible, the beliefs of the people supporting a conflicting philosophy. That is part of the conscious or unconscious struggle for the domination of the world.

In this struggle the United States of America has led. In it the level of living of the common man is the highest in the world and has held that place for many years. This fact cannot be denied effectively by anyone; and the American capitalistic system has,without doubt, been a major factor in this amazing accomplishment. Recently, the Nazis challenged our leadership; they were destroyed. They did not know how weak **they** were. The Japanese militarists made the greatest mistake in their national history when they thought **they** were superior. They were destroyed, also. And now many believe we have a new challenger in Soviet Russia. Despite the amazingly low level of living there (in part due to historical factors and war) its leaders believe their system will prove superior to any in

the world. Americans do not so believe.

Thus, wisely or unwisely, the challenged and the challenger are looking each other over, comparing strong and weak points, and getting ready for "any eventuality." Soviet Russia is preparing a series of five-year plans to increase its military and industrial power, while relatively neglecting (but not overlooking) the comfort and well-being of the people. America, many believe, is neglecting its military power and relaxing centralized controls to stimulate free enterprise to increase civilian production and raise materially the comfort and well-being of its people, perhaps beyond anything yet conceived by mankind. Soviet Russia is authoritarian; America is relatively free. Economic progress in Russia, though on a distinctly lower plane, is relatively stable, while in the United States progress is erratic, subject to huge fluctuations which affect the whole world. The struggle of social systems for dominance is under way.

Coupled with the competition of ideologies and social systems is the actual conflict of "empires" themselves. Imperialism, the prime cause of two devastating wars in one generation, still rears its ugly head. Today it shows itself again in the conflict of Soviet Russia and the western democracies for the advantage of position in the "unsettled" zones between the two empires. Russia's expansionist interests in eastern Germany, in the Middle East and in the Balkans are of vital concern to the British; and the safety of the United States is also considerably involved, according to Nathaniel Peffer, who said:

> Now, however, with the range of weapons incomparably extended and the mobility of men and arms eased and accelerated, a disproportionate increase of power in any country anywhere is a potential threat to every other country, no matter where. Furthermore, there are not so many parties involved now as to neutralize each other. Two world wars have eliminated most of them. There are in fact only two—Great Britain and Russia.
>
> For practical purposes this means for America, Russia. And by all current signs the aggrandizement of Russia is under way both eastward and westward. The British Empire lies directly in its path, but America is only one remove away, and America has already expressed its concern and opposition.[8]

Thus, a new conflict of empire stalks the world. This time America is involved more than ever before.

Russian activities in Manchuria, too, are of immediate concern to America. And America's bases in the Pacific as well as American dominance in Japan and China are of concern to the Russians, for they fear encirclement by the capitalist countries.

Since the Russian "empire" is at the present dynamic, more attention needs to be given to its threats to the stability of the empires of the western powers. From 1939 to 1945 Soviet Russia has added territories larger in area than Spain. Though treaty arrangements were not completed, the "de facto" holdings of Russia were, in 1945,: Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Eastern Poland, Bessarabia, and Bukovina, Moldavia, Carpatho-Ukraine, East Prussia, Karelo-Finland, Petsamo, Finland, Tanna Tuva,

Southern Sakhalin and the Kurile Islands, making a total of 273,947 square miles and a population of 24,355,500 persons newly brought under the influence of the Soviet system. In addition, the actual influence of Soviet Russia extended "deep into Central Europe and into the Chinese areas abutting Siberia". Said The New York Times:

> Along her 2,000-mile southern frontier from the western shore of the Black Sea to India she has seemed to follow the historic course of Russian Governments since the time of Peter the Great (1672-1925) for "windows" to the warm seas and for a voice in the affairs of the Middle East.[9]

Obviously, the western democracies are of necessity opposed to such expansion, and will prevent or limit it at every point possible. This means frequent conflict of one form or another.

And the conflict of today has its upsetting aspects, for when the Russians take over an area, not only do they govern, but they destroy the capitalistic system (in whole or in part) and substitute their own. In the Russian occupied zone in Germany, plants not dismantled for war booty have been socialized; that is, former owners have been removed, the property turned over to the state or district and operated by local government officials.[10] In March, 1946, 70 per cent of the industries of Czechoslovakia (some whose ownership was uncertain because of the war and Nazi operations) were nationalized by a Provisional Government under the influence of Moscow.[11] Thus, a state, merely in the sphere of influence of Russia, may be largely socialized. In Yugoslavia, too, Tito, a member of the Russian school, is reconstructng the country on the communist pattern; and he is expected to take Trieste for Yugoslavia, thus giving Russia indirect access to the Mediterranean.[12] Russia's gain is not only someone's loss but is also a threat to existing empires; i.e. those of Great Britain and the United States.

At present the Russian policy seems to be to make threats to force Britain and the United States to make concessions because of their strong desire to make the United Nations a success, to separate the British and the Americans if they seem to be arousing deep-seated feelings like those connected with the burning of Washington, D.C. in the war of 1812, and to promise food and shelter to the underprivileged colonial peoples of the empires.[13]

Obviously, the western democracies are not standing by idly, watching their empires being whittled away. They are responding by insisting on their "rights" wherever possible, by a world-wide program of food distribution to peoples in need, for the sincere purpose of helping them and at the same time winning their loyalty. In addition, they are planning investments and developments in the countries near to Russia of the type that will benefit the people of these countries and further their admiration for the American way of life.[14] And serious attempts are being made to unify China and to start Japan well along toward the road to democracy and to cooperation with the democratic world. At the same time it is without doubt the intention of America to continue to operate and keep in readiness many of its air and naval bases all over the world.

Thus, in addition to the potent atomic bomb and the competition of social systems there is an actual and/or potential conflict of empires. War is always a possibility.

The pressure of colonial peoples for the release from the yoke of empire is increasing. Many serious writers fear that "revolt and war will be the outcome if the old game of world colonies continues to be played as it has been in the past." The 19th Century ethics so well expressed by Kipling,

> Take up white man's burden,
> Send forth the best ye breed,
> Go bind your sons to Exile
> To serve your captives' need.

is now being challenged on every hand. Over seven hundred thousand persons, living on one-third of the earth's surface, exist under what might well be called slum conditions because they have been utilized primarily to provide the raw materials for the empires. Says Junius B. Wood,

> As the outside world loses its mystery for the native, he realizes that colonial systems are not designed entirely for his benefit and has little gratitude for whatever good he has got from them. The result is that colonial powers, their prestige tarnished, now must use force to maintain their rule.
>
> For the same reasons, physical strength is the strongest argument which the colonials have to obtain more self-government or freedom.[15]

Recent bloody events in Malaya, Indo-China and the Dutch East Indies are but signs of the impending conflicts that may materialize if peaceful solutions are not found soon for the colonial problems.

Perhaps Jawaharlal Nehru, member of the India Congress Party's Working Committee, has expressed most clearly the viewpoint of the colonial peoples generally (if not universally) when he said:

> The future of the colonies? The obvious answer is that there is no future for them as colonies, that the whole system known as colonialism has to go. . .It is evident that the people of the colonial empires are in a rebellious mood and cannot be suppressed for long, and every attempt to suppress them is a drain on the ruling country, which weakens it.[16]

On the other hand, the empires are trying to hold on to their colonies as long as possible; but there is little expectation that this can be done for an extended period.

This tense situation is a serious weakness of the western democracies; and it is uniquely a problem of the democracies and not of Soviet Russia which has in large part "solved" the problems of the control of diverse peoples by making them members of autonomous republics within the Soviet Union. And the Russians are taking all the advantage they can of this situation to increase the restlessness of the colonial peoples. They promise the masses of underprivileged people a better life in understandable terms, while the empires talk about nationalism and democracy,

concepts vaguely understood by illiterate and hungry masses.

The empires are, consequently, faced with a serious dilemma; if they seek to thwart the drive of the masses for freedom by aligning themselves with detested native reactionaries, the mass of the people will turn more and more to the Russian ideology. But the empires do not desire such a result. Perhaps the only answer is for them to face "squarely the social problem in those part of the world that are backward socially as well as politically and technologically." [17]

Thus, the colonial problem is another of the vital world problems of the new age. Unsolved, it can easily become the starting point of a major war.

The atom bomb, ideologies of social, political and economic organization, world empire and colonies all seem to be one whole—a fearful mixture of potentialities and materials, highly combustible.

What is the duty of practical social scientists and teachers in the world today? They neglect their responsibilities if they cannot show how a peaceful world, under law, with respect for all, can be built, and how the problems of the current age can be solved or lessened in the process. Consequently, the remainder of this bulletin turns to a consideration of the trends of the new age that give hope of achieving this ideal. There will be considered the technical developments that make it physically possible for the world to be one, the promising social and economic trends, new possibilities in international relations and the promise of the United Nations. A later bulletin will consider some specific suggestions for the schools.

---

1. Morrison, Phillip—"Beyond Imagination"—**New Republic,** February 11, 1946.
2. Stalin, Joseph—"Premier Stalin's Election Speech"—**The New York Times,** February 10, 1946.
3. Fisher, Irving—"Letter to the Editor of the New York Times"—**The New York Times,** February 27, 1946.
4. Lawrence, W. H.—"Soviet's Foreign Moves Linked to Home Crisis"—**The New York Times,** March 17, 1946.
5. Churchill, Winston—"Speech at Westminister College, Fulton, Missouri" as recorded in **The New York Times,** March 6, 1946.
6. Stalin, Joseph—**op. cit.**
7. Fisher, Irving—**op. cit.**
8. Peffer, Nathaniel—"Have vs. Have-Nots, Left vs. Right"—**New York Times Magazine,** April 7, 1946.
9. **The New York Times,** March 17, 1946.
10. McLaughlin, Kathleen—"Russians to Strip 600 German Mills"—**The New York Times,** March 24,1946.
11. MacCormac, John—"Big Part of Czech Industry Is Taken over by the State"—**The New York Times,** March 24, 1946.
12. MacCormac John—"Balkans Now Part of Soviet System"—**The New York Times,** March 3, 1946.
13. Sulzberger, C. L.—"Russia Mixes Communism with Imperialist Aims", **The New York Times,** March 24, 1946.
14. Lasswell, Harold D.—"World Politics Faces Economics"—New York, McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1945, pp. 76 ff.
15. Wood, Junius B.—"The Twilight of Empire"—**Nations Business,** March 3, 1946.
16. Nehru, Jawaharlal—"Colonialism Must Go"—**New York Times Magazine,** March 3, 1946.
17. Peffer, Nathaniel—**op. cit.**

MAN MAKES HIS GEOGRAPHY GLOBAL

Floyd Perkins

The events of the war years have made the people of the world, and especially the people of the United States, more conscious of other parts of the world. The Coral Sea, Dakar, Rabaul and Bizerte are names with which many of us have become familiar only during the past few years. Before that time many of our people knew but little about other parts of the world and cared less. We were told by certain individuals that the two large oceans, and the friendly neighbors on the north and south, gave the United States a position of safety and security in the world. But events have occurred which placed this country as close to Europe as England was to Napoleon.

The extent of geographical knowledge possessed by a primitive man consisted of information about the expanse of territory he could see from the top of a hill. It was when hunger, flood or some other major catastrophy occurred that he sought another environment. He took what the climate, soil, and other resources of his immediate surroundings offered and governed his activities accordingly. His food, both animal and vegetable,consisted of what was at hand. Hence the life of man living in one geographic environment and the lives of other men living in other geographic environments differed widely. But regardless of where they lived, they responded to the geographic forces that were usually unseen but always present, operating to modify and limit man's life and activities.

As knowledge gradually grew, primitive man began to have a better understanding of what lay beyond his immediate environment. At the time of Homer, about 900 B.C., the world was confined chiefly to the Mediterranean Sea and the lands immediately adjacent to it. The farther away from Greece a place was, the more indistinct and hazy was the Greeks' information about it. The vagueness of geographic knowledge and information was in direct proportion to the distance from Greece. Homer's map of the world is a disc-shaped affair with Greece as the focal point. Civilizations in this region rose and fell. Their standards of living did not call for goods or materials that could not be furnished in the then known world; hence, they knew little or nothing of what lay beyond a very restricted portion of the earth.

Babylonia was similar to Greece with respect to geographic knowledge. Here a map of the world would have been confined to a restricted area surrounding this ancient cultural center. It was self-sufficient. Therefore, trade with the "outside" world was not necessary.

The map of Ptolemy, about the second century, included territory not shown on Homer's map of 900 B.C. It added small parts of the Indian Ocean and a considerable part of Asia. It presupposed the Indian Ocean to be a body of water much like the Mediterranean Sea—both surrounded by land. But this map, like that of Homer's, still depicted the world as a disc.

However, man's knowledge of his world continued to increase. This knowledge was cumulated very slowly as bits of information about "dis-

tant" lands were added to what was already known. Kings and rulers made war upon their neighbors and information was gathered by soldiers who told of distant lands. Trade between different parts of the then known world was established and over-land and sea routes led to distant lands, especially to China and India as a result of the information contained in Marco Polo's publication concerning his travels. The effect was to gain more knowledge about the earth. Science and mathematics contributed to an understanding of this knowledge so that when trade routes from the Mediterranean countries over-land to the south Asiatic lands were cut off by the Turks, the contributions of Eratesthenes, Aristotle, Anaximander, Ptolemy, Roger Bacon, Toscanelli and others made entirely logical the theory of Columbus, that one could reach a place east of a given position by traveling west. History tells us that Columbus had a hard time to sell his idea to the then great maritime powers of Europe—Genoa and Venice. They hesitated to launch such expeditions as those advocated by Columbus not so much because they rejected the idea that the earth is a sphere as because they had few if any vessels equipped for ocean travel. It meant turning from the convenient geography of the time to a geograhpy much larger in scope and involving revolutionary ideas. They voted for the status quo in spite of the fact that they were aware of the geography involved, for to be governed by the new idea meant the expenditure of money for new ocean-going equipment, and longer and more dangerous voyages, all of which meant smaller profits. Spain and Portugal were competitors of Italy in the world of trade but the latter held the supremacy. So it was Spain and Portugal that invested capital for explorations that resulted in turning Europe from an east to a west-facing continent. Geographical knowledge increased with such voyages as those of Vasco de Gama and Magellan. Another milestone was passed. **Thus the primary concept of geography as indicated by the disc map changed to a concept represented by the sphere.** Since spheres were difficult to make and to handle, the cylinder map was devised to guide the slow sailing ships to their destinations. Vessels took advantage of the prevailing wind system of the earth, sailing east with the west blowing winds and west with the Trades.

The next major change in man-made geography came about when he replaced the sail with the steam engine. This reduced travel time and sailing distances, for the vessels could now travel on the ocean without regard to favorable winds. Speed was the important factor. Sailing distances were further shortened by building canals such as Suez and Panama. The saving of time was the all-important factor, for to save time meant greater profits for the owners of the vessel.

During the days of the sailing vessels the Mercator map was used by mariners because a straight line between two places on the map indicated the correct compass course. But in the days when speed was the important factor the shortest distance between two points on the earth's surface was significant. Such a course cannot be plotted directly on a Mercator map. It was necessary to perfect a map that would show the great circle routes more nearly correctly. Several such map projections are now available. **Hence, the "great circle" concept advanced geography another step—**

the disc, to the cylinder, to the global considerations.

We are here attempting to show that geography is really man-made. It is not something apart from his existence and his activities. With every new invention resulting from science and technology man becomes less and less dependent upon his natural environment and more dependent upon his man-made environment. Among the more recent developments has been that of flying a heavier-than-air machine. Until the internal combustion engine was put into an airplane, man's activities were rather well limited to land and water. Now we think in terms of a third dimension. This "conquest" of the air has already made changes in our ways of living and is destined to make many more. Places and things we once thought of great consequence have shrunk in importance, and things and places we once considered of little importance have loomed large. For example, we once attached great importance to the control of strategic positions on the sea lanes of the world. With the advent of the airplane the importance of such control has been diminished. If an enemy gets control of a strategic point the opposition can fly over or around it with comparative ease. Of far greater importance, however, is the effect the airplane will make on the peace-time lives of the people of the world.

Once again gigantic changes have come about in geography. As pictured by a map, this change is from the Mercator (sailors' geography) to the polar maps of the air age. So man's science and technology have changed geography from that where attention was forcused on the land, to that where attention was forcused on the sea, and finally to a geography which is focused on the air.

As far as we in America are concerned, we were not greatly interested in the early ocean geography, for at the time it was being developed by European countries we were busy with the "conquest of the continent." and up to the present time. we have been able to live rather well from the resources of our heritage. But we are beginning to see the end. As a nation we have maintained that we are not interested in outlying possessions. Moreover, we have given the world the impression that we were not particularly interested in what goes on outside the territory of the United States. We have called ourselves isolationists. As a result, we have not, as a nation, felt the need of a thorough knowledge of the geography of the world. But whether we like it or not, the rest of the world is less than fifty hours away. It follows, therefore, that if we are to live in the world of today we will have to have a thorough knowledge of the geopraphy of that world. As John W. Studebaker, United States Commissioner of Education, says, "Now is the time to teach the American people geography. I think we are more illiterate in geography than any other civilized nation. The reason is that we have never been taught geography. Young people have stopped studying geography beyond the seventh and eighth grades of the schools. I recommend that in some way throughout the secondary schools and colleges and universities a real effort be made to acquaint American citizens with the realities of the world situation."

MODERN SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC TRENDS

H. P. Lohrman

The writer has been assigned the problem of analyzing the world situation today for the observance of socio-economic trends which give some hint of the nature of things to come. This is no easy task; the situation at present resembles nothing so much as that celebrated person who dashed off in all directions at one time. We appear to be caught in a veritable vortex of forces which take us nowhere but around and around. It is not difficult to find numerous expressions of hope and sentiment indicating the direction toward which men turn their wishes. There has been a tremendous outpouring of articles, books, and speeches, usually couched in terms of "we must" or "we ought". We hear many glittering generalities such as "The New World", "The Century of the Common Man", and the like. While these are often no more than aspirations, or indeed the cries of men perplexed and frustrated, they help us to understand what men are thinking and hoping—even when the trend of events in men's activities is quite at variance with their expressions of opinion and desire.

It is, nevertheless, no time to despair and return to cynicism and disillusionment. We are, it is true, witnessing the clash of seemingly irreconcilable interests and ideologies which often impress one with a boding sense of oncoming disaster. Such disaster may come, but not inevitably.

We are living in one of these ages when the dynamics of change have been enormously accelerated. What has happened to us has not been a sudden and unanticipated atomic explosion, but the outcome of factors which man has created, but not controlled. We have, during the past three decades, been confronted with problems which are inherent in the scientific-technological revolution which began well over a century ago. We are only now beginning to understand this revolution and its impact upon social life. When we understand it much better, we shall gain that much more control over it. This understanding is the crucial task which confronts all social scientists, both those who conduct research and analysis, and those of us who prepare our young people for their participation in modern society.

It is impossible, in a paper the length of this one, to treat current trends and their backgrounds as ought to be done. It will have to suffice to discuss very briefly certain major trends, and then to suggest the study of the works listed at the end of this article for further analysis.

Certainly one of the major trends in which the men of this day's world are caught up is that in which we have been moving from social structures in which the dominant characteristics were self-sufficiency and primary-personal relationships. In such times, that which we now call **isolationism** was perfectly feasible. The basic needs of men could be and generally were satisfied through localized effort. In similar fashion, men regulated and controlled their own small societies. For the greatest part of his history on this globe, man has been a village animal, his world circumscribed by the limits of his clan, tribe, or city-state. Not even the great mass movements of history, nor the conquests of Alexanders and Jhengis Khans

very much affected the essential village nature of man. Through the milleniums, man became reasonably well adjusted in habit, attitude, and sentiment, in modes of social control and economic exploitation, to the village situation.

It requires no Einstein of economics, sociology, or psychology to show us that this limited world no longer exists. It was destroyed by steam, by electric wires, by the printing press, by gasoline, by the electronic tube, and finally by jet propulsion and atomic fission. In the old world, men's contacts were primary and personal, were confined to the people among whom he was born, whom he could see daily, and touch with his hands, his eyes, his nose. We continue to have such contacts, of course, but our senses are constantly bombarded in addition by countless stimuli from everywhere in the world. Our world of social interaction has become enormously expanded. The vast majority of these interactions are utterly impersonal, categoric, and involuntary. Try as we will to escape them, we cannot; so inexorable are they in their operation that individuals are frequently at a loss to understand what is happening to them. To use a very simple illustration, it was once very simple to build a house in which to live and rear a family. One simply gathered together the materials from the immediate environment, called together his neighbors and put the house together. Today, developments all over the world conspire to say to the would-be housebuilder, "You shall have no house—yet."

These considerations give substance to the frequently reiterated statement anent the "oneness" of the world today. It is not one in the same that there are no conflicts of interest and ideology. Albeit there is no unity in the world, there is a strain toward unity and integration. The earth today is by no means analagous to a biological organism, yet the temptation to compare world economic, social, political relationships to the organic unity of a biological entity is hard to avoid. Certainly, a condition which exists in one part of the world today, as completely produces tensions throughout the earth as an attack of indigestion throws the entire body out of adjustment.

Whatever else may be said of today's world, it is very obviously far more complex for individuals, communities and nations than it once was. This is so obvious it should need no comment, yet our behavior all too often suggests that we are continuing to try to live in a world where the greatest complexity grew out of an overcrowded cave.

There is no question whatever but that our total range of social relationships will become even more complex and intricate as the decades come and go. This complex world needs to be brought under control. It is not for the social scientist alone to say how it shall be controlled, but it will be suicidal for us to allow ourselves to drift leaderless and rudderless. There is a clear call to begin the search for leaders among our children, and to spend as much effort and money upon their training as we spend upon that for B-29 crew members!

It must be the people who decide, upon the basis of the researches of the social scientists, how they want to manage their societies. The alternative is to drift into the chaos out of which emerges some such "isms" as communism or fascism. These too, are systems of management, systems

utterly repulsive to the American people. Such things as recurring inflation-deflation cycles, with attendant unemployment, high relief rates, business failures, strikes and industrial strife—these and other conditions are symptomatic of a socio-economic system which does not function properly. It is one of our first problems to see to it that this system does function well enough to satisfy the reasonable needs of our people.

A good many of the trends now in existence are but the continuation of those which have been shaping our lives for a long time. It seems certain, for example, that world-wide urbanization will continue for the world as a whole, at an even accelerated rate. By urbanization I refer not merely to the physical growth of cities in size and population, but to the further diffusion of urban ways of life and culture, and to the increasing power of cities—economically, politically, and in other respects. In spite of famine and pestilence and war, the earth's population will grow very rapidly during the coming century. This will be particularly true in Asia, in the Soviet "Sixth of the World", in Africa, and probably in South America. The present rural populations of the world will not soon check their numerical increase. But they are very likely to turn more and more to the machines and the technologies which are so greatly transforming American agriculture. Fewer hands will be required to till the world's acres; but the hands will continue to appear, and will migrate to the cities.

In the United States, our cities will continue to grow, but most certainly at the expense of the central city and to the gain, in numbers, at least, of the suburban and satellite areas.

The Indusrial Revolution has not run its course; since 1900 industrialism has burst the seams which had confined it to England and a few other areas. Since 1921 industrialism has become a **fait accompli** in Russia, where it will proceed with renewed impetus. Whether Russia uses her industrial potential to improve the plane of living of her people, or to build cannons for world conquest remains to be seen. It is in the undetermined answer to this question that much of the future developments for the entire world lies.

If and when China is able to resolve her political problems, she will move industrial-wise, as will India, portions of Africa, and South America. Industrialism in the older nations can hardly be expected to recede.

Industrial development will be a boon to millions of men who have for thousands of years exploited their resources only through the expenditure of back-breaking toil. It will, however, be no unmitigated blessing. The possession of unlimited material gadgets, a different suit for every day of the week, and longer hours for leisure does not always spell happiness and peace. It very often places great emphasis upon pecuniary values and fosters a crass materialism. It can, and often does, rob men of their creativeness and plunges them into a vacuum too often filled with vicious idleness, crushing impersonality, and the frustration of human values. These conditions are not necessarily inherent in urban-industrialism, but when a people who have been accommodated for untold ages to a handicraft, village way of life, are suddenly immersed in a culture dominated by machines and dollars, they do not always adjust adequately. It is to be hoped that the rising industrial societies can profit by our errors of omis-

sion and commission, and through the establishment of education and the other institutions, economic, political, and social, which we have been slowly evolving, escape the worst of our problems.

Nor will world-wide industrialism immediately remove all the tensions which in the past have led to international problems culminating in war. For example, will Chinese industrialists insist upon a Hamiltonian tariff? And if they do, what will be the reply in the United States, in England, in India? Whatever plans are made in this respect, free trade will hardly have a place among them.

Political developments are treated in another part of this publication. However, the realms of politics and economics are so inextricably enmeshed that it is impossible to keep them separate, even for purposes of analysis. No discussion of economic trends would be complete without some attention to one of the most crucial sets of factors today facing us—the contravention of the totalitarian-communist and the democratic free-enterprise capitalist way of life. Is private capitalism doomed, as certain of its critics maintain? Obviously such questions require more time and space than is here available. It is to be noted that there is no lessening of insistence in the United States upon the preservation of the free enterprise system. Virtually all business men, manufacturers, distributors, politicians believe it the best possible of all economics. The most powerful of our labor leaders declare their faith in it, and the American farmer is solidly a free enterpriser.

The situation is different in varying degrees elsewhere. No comment is necessary for Soviet Russia. According to some observers, free capitalism, as we know it, is forever doomed in much of eastern Europe. England is under a Labor government with an affirmed socialistic program of nationalization. The contest between nationalization and private enterprise is not yet settled in France and Italy. The Scandinavian countries are famed for their cooperative programs. The struggle between the communists and nationalists goes on little abated in China. Without attempting **a priori** to predict the outcome of this contravention of idealogies, it does appear to be safe to assert that unless the problems of production and distribution, of employment and adequate living standards are resolved to the satisfaction of the masses of men, some form of collectivism is very likely to make strong gains. Hungry, ill-clothed, frightened, disillusioned men have no compelling propensity to see anything sacred in **any** economic system.

There can be little doubt that a decided trend today orients men toward international and intercontinental cooperation. Even although rival ideologies and rival nationalisms constantly threaten to disintegrate it, there is an essential oneness in the interaction of the peoples of the earth. Although variant political idealogies, religious doctrines, nationalistic chauvinism, and racial antipathies may militate against unified action, nothing today permits any large group of human beings to carry on as they please without creating serious tensions. There is at least hope today that having suffered two devasting global wars, and threatened with the fearsome danger of explosive atomic energy, men may implement and improve the U.N. and its several organs for effective collaboration.

The concept of One World does not envision anything like uniformity

or sameness. The American nation has risen to greatness the while she fostered within her borders a great variety of languages, religions, political creeds, nationalities, and races—a heterogeneous people with a diversified culture, integrated through common experience and the holding of a few fundamentally basic values. We have learned in America that cultural pluralism not only does not weaken our national fabric, but rather enriches and revitalizes it. On a vaster scale, the earth, a comparable phenomenon, can be made to develop.

In these early days of the U.N. when political problems are to the fore, it is easy to overemphasize the importance of the weakness of the Security Council, and to forget or to minimize certain other agencies. As political problems are resolved, such agencies of the U.N. as the Economic and Social Council will assume new significance. Of particular interest, not only to teachers, but to all who hope for and labor for inter-understandings of all sorts, is the UNESCO. While teachers have always been significant in promoting intercultural education, they have now been officially recognized as an essential factor. It should not be necessary to suggest that this places upon teachers the necessity of a thorough understanding of the socio-economic factors which so greatly influence our lives today.

In conclusion, we merely name other trends likely to be continued or to develop within the next decade or more. World currencies will not return to a gold standard, but will be managed and stabilized through international agreement and operation. Scientific research in all areas will be greatly extended, and the results brought to bear in every-widening circles. It is likely, in this connection, that governments will become directly involved in scientific research, at least to the extent of providing funds. Greater attention will be given henceforth to population policies and the problems of human migration. Social services of the kind we call Social Security will be extended, geographically, and to groups not now covered. Pressure for independence or autonomy will develop in several parts of the world, such as Nigeria.

The world will be a New World—it is always a new world. It will not, however, be a world which is created out of whole new cloth; in the new world there will be much more of the old than of the new. It will not, certainly, by a world in which there are no problems, no tensions, no insecurities. If we want that kind of world, it will be well for us to plunge into an atomic bomb race—and let someone or something start all over again.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Angell, Robert C., **The Integration of American Society**, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1941.

Becker, Carl L., **How New Will the Better World Be?**, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1944.

Birdsall, Paul V., **Versailles Twenty Years After**, Reynald and Hitchcock, New York, 1941.

Boutwell, W. D., **America Prepares for Tomorrow**, Harper and Bros., New York, 1941.

Chase, Stuart, **Tomorrow's Trade**, Twentieth Century Fund, New York, 1945.

Condliffe, J. B., **Agenda for a Postwar World**, Norton & Co., Inc., New York, 1942.

Harris, Seymour E., Editor, **Postwar Economic Problems**, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1943

Hayek, F. A., **The Road to Serfdom,** University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1944.
Lippman, Walter, **Foreign Policy: Shield of the Republic,** Little, Brown & Co., Boston, 1943.
MacIver, Robert M., **Towards an Abiding Peace,** Macmillan, New York, 1943.
McCormick, Thomas C. T., editor, **Problems of the Postwar World,** McGraw-Hill, New York, 1945.
Reves, Emery, **The Anatomy of Peace,** Harper & Brothers, New York, 1945.
Sorokin, Pitirim, **Social and Cultural Dynamics,** 4 v., American Book Company, New York, 1937.

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS OF THE NEW AGE

John Cochrane

The primary objective of our foreign policy is peace. Peace means more than the absence of actual war. It means also the absence of international suspicion and tension and the assurances that peaceful enterprise will not be interrupted by destructive and savage warfare. The details of our foreign policy must be worked out in relation to this primary objective, with an open-minded and realistic approach. At present we are compelled to recognize the fact that we cannot safely discard military preparedness without shirking our responsibilities and weakening our effectiveness in promoting real pace. We cannot escape these responsibilities with a clear conscience, for we are not only rich in material potentialities, but also in our firm belief in the principles and ideals upon which our nation was founded. We have demonstrated in peace and war that we believe these ideals and principles are worth more than life itself. The threat of Nazism in our time has emphasized once again the values of democracy, and the necessity of achieving a democratic world, if the world is to be made safe for democracy.

When we understand and accept the implications of democracy, it is clear that we are only at the beginning of a democratic world. The possibilities for the continued expansion of democracy are limitless, even within our own country. Three-fourths of the people of the world possess only a modicum of the benefits of democracy. If democracy is to triumph, we must defend it and extend its ideals and principles at home and abroad. This does not mean that democracy is to be imposed; rather we must demonstrate the superiority of our way of life over any other system. For the time being we must keep ourselves strong militarily and otherwise, in this day of science and speed. We must be ready for instant action if necessary, in the defense of democracy. We have become progressively less secure, as a result of scientific discoveries and inventions, especially when applied to military weapons. For the present we dare not rely solely on international collaboration. In the meantime we must do everything we can to devise and promote methods for the peaceful adjustment of differences among the nations. We believe this can be accomplished by an extension of the principles of democracy at home, and an active promotion of freedom with justice among the peoples of the world.

The United States has emerged as the greatest world power. For over a century we followed a general policy of isolationism. Such a policy is understandable for the world of the nineteenth century—the century of revolutionary change. Science and invention ushered in the industrial revolution, which in turn affected the political and social life of the people. Power and wealth shifted rapidly in the western world, from the landlords to the new industrialist, shifting the center of class conflict to capital and labor. The key to the understanding of this conflict is relatively simple—an equitable distribution of the wealth produced. The method of securing a more equitable distribution, and thus abating the conflict, is where the chief difficulty lies. This is one of the fundamental problems of our world today and one which must be solved if we are to have a peaceful world. Exploitation of peoples for the benefit of a privileged few is at the root of

most of our troubles today. A recognition of the fact of interdependence of all peoples makes it clear that we must all rise together. The advancement of the interests and privileges of a particular group at the expense of everyone else will result in ruin for all. In our new and interdependent world new ways must be found for abating the conflicts arising from this problem of distribution. An educational program in interdependence must be worked out for the peoples of the world.

Machines have played a major role n the development of the national state. Machines have made possible the effective administration of such vast areas as the United States. Without these machines of transportation, communication and production it is very likely that this country would have broken up into several separate independent states, as indicated in the attempted secession of the South. In a similar manner the whole world has been drawn closer and closer together. We can no longer pretend that it is possible to live in isolation either as an individual or as a nation. The world has become a community, and humanity must rise or fall together. It is with reluctance that we with our traditions of the frontier and rugged individualism are forced to recognize the world as a neighborhood, and to realize that it is no longer possible to "clear out for Arkansas" or "take to the tall timber".

The history of our foreign policy for the past century indicates that we have become progressively aware of the fact that isolationism cannot be successfully maintained. Toward Asia, and especially toward China and Japan, we have not shown the same reluctance to participate actively with western powers in the determination of international policies, as we have in direct participation with the same powers in European affairs proper. Our part in the opening of Japan, and our persistence in upholding the integrity of China, and the open-door policy, illustrate this difference between our Asiatic and European polities. Our insistence upon the official designation of **associated power** rather than **ally** during World War I, our rejection of peace treaties, and our refusal to join the League of Nations, indicate the persistence of our pioneer instinct to keep to ourselves with relation to European affairs. In the background, however, during the time before World War II, we were quite active in various international affairs. President Roosevelt was especially active in trying to prevent the outbreak of World War II. During the war the designation of United Nations was readily accepted by the nation. Our country has taken the lead in the formulation of the Charter of the United Nations, and in promoting its success. This does not mean, however, that we have been willing to surrender any of our independence and sovereignty to make certain the effectiveness of the United Nations as a peace organization. There are tests which will arise in implementing the present Charter or in the adoption of amendments to correct weaknesses, which may become obvious as time passes. In conclusion, we are compelled, however reluctantly, to recognize the fact that the United States has emerged as a leading world power. It is our duty to our country and to the world to accept the responsibility of world leadership, guided by the beacon light of peace and justice for ourselves and all people.

We firmly believe that democratic ideals and imperialism are natural

opposing forces. Imperialism means some degree of domination. It denies the right of government by the consent of the governed. It also denies equality of rights and privileges. There is increasing evidence that those basic democratic ideals of the eighteenth century still persist in an ever expanding role today. Changes within the British Empire, such as the progress of the Commonwealths of Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa from colonial status to complete independence, and a similar trend in India, seems to prove that British imperial policy has been brought into conformity with democracy. Britain's acceptance of the mandate principle at the conclusion of World War I is another example. The United States had, in general, championed the cause of democracy, as applied to people, from the beginning, the Mexican and Civil War notwithstanding. Manifest destiny and the preservation of the Union were transcendant motives in these two wars. Our support of an independent and democratically governed China, our Philippine policy, and our Latin American policies have, in general, conformed to democratic priniciples. The inconsistency of colonialism and democracy was recognized back in the days of the war wth Spain, and we have been unable to this day to reconcile the two. Thus, today, we of the United States, the people of Britain, and many others, have already extended or are preparing to extend democracy to our colonies as rapidly as possible, with complete independence as the ultimate goal.

The rapid advancement of science and invention has increased the destructiveness of war. For the past fifty years, man has shown increasing concern over the potential destructiveness of military weapons. The Hague Conferences, conciliation, arbitration, the League of Nations, etc. are evidences of the increasing desire for peace and for the elimination of war. The Kellogg-Briand Peace Pact, outlawing war, as an instrument of national policy received the verbal approval of practically all nations. The leaders of the vanquished are on trial as criminals at the present time. Since science and invention have virtually created our One World, wars tend to spread and become World Wars. Wars not only tend to encompass the world, but they also tend to become total, involving all the people and all of their worldly possessions. Battle fields are now continental in scope. Thus, the nature of modern war makes the conversion of the people of the world to peaceful ideals our most important task. The peace-loving nations must not permit less important differences, and the backwash of old outmoded policies, to set them against each other. Many things remain to be done to eradicate the roots of war. Awareness of what these roots are is indicated by the provisions of the United Nations Charter. They are to be found in every nation where there is fear, want, religious and racial intolerance, and attempted suppression of freedom of thought and ideas. It will take time to dig up the roots, and in the meantime we must constantly prune away the sprouts. We may anticipate the necessity of using force to keep the peace, by organizing an international police force and the maintenance of adequate national military forces by the peace-loving nations. Reduction of such forces must depend upon the degree of security of the freedoms of democracy. Disarmament without security would be folly.

Illiteracy is one of the greatest obstacles to the extension of democracy,

especially in Asia, Africa, and the South Pacific. Even after fundamental educational changes have been achieved, such as the simplification of the tools of learning, it will take time to attain an effective degree of literacy in these areas. Media for a more effective transmission of thought and information within the range of all the people, must be devised as the first important step toward literacy. The content of the education program, however, is even more important than literacy itself. The method and purpose of education is most important. In our own country we educate for democracy. Our aim as to method and content is to teach the individual to think independently—to plan and live his own life within our democratic framework. Special safeguards have been set up to insure the protection of education against political, religious, or other restrictions that might be devised by any special group. Education is firmly in the hands of educators in our system of public education. Academic freedom is the essence of democracy. Progress in education then depends upon the educators. It is their responsibility to keep education a sharp and effective instrument for the promotion of the more abundant life for all. A major responsibility for educators today is education for peace. Among other things, this involves a new and critical analysis of such familiar concepts as liberty, democracy, nationalism, etc., in the light of changing world conditions. A universally acceptable definition for each concept probably cannot be arrived at, but the heart of each should be made plain to all.

We seem to be at the beginning of a new era. The hope, as well as the necessity, for an enduring peace is strong. The age-old struggle between the forces of darkness and evil on the one hand, and the forces of light and goodness on the other, which is now in a most critical stage, will result in victory for the right. History presents strong evidence of the upward climb of humanity, and our Christian faith confirms our belief in a purpose and a plan in the affairs of man. On the side of right there is an impelling urge to put forth our best efforts in the achievement of a major contribution—the elimination of war. The hearts and minds of people everywhere must be converted to a love for peace, and away from the evils and hatreds engendered by war. We, as citizens of an enlightened and progressive democracy, have a major responsibility in the struggle to save civilization. From now on our foreign policy must become a major concern of all American citizens. We must know the truth. We must be informed. Knowledge of international affairs is fundamental if we are to lead as a nation in this fight for a permanent peace. The issue is plain—war must be eliminated for all time, if civilization is to endure.

TOWARD LAW AND PEACE ON AN INTERNATIONAL SCALE

R. G. Riggs

"After every great war the victors find the making of peace difficult and disappointing. It took the 13 American states more than five years after winning their independence to agree upon a constitution which promised anything like a durable peace among themselves. To build world peace, bridging differences in ideas. values, codes of conduct and deeply cherished aspirations, requires even greater tolerance, patience and understanding. It requires the will and ability to seek the best, to accept the best obtainable, and then to make the best obtainable work. As war breeds war, so peace can be made to breed peace."

Secretary of State Byrnes used the above statement to open his radio report to the American people (July 15, 1946) upon his return from the Big Four Foreign Ministers' Conference in Paris. His complete report, together with those made a few days later by Senators Vandenberg and Connally, should be read carefully by all Americans who hope for lasting peace. We can easily become discouraged with present conditions in the world because of the constant radio and press reports of verbal conflicts between the leaders of various nations. When we examine the accounts of the many meetings which have been held recently, we gain fresh insight into the complexity of the problem and can appreciate the progress which has taken place.

What is the exact status of the trend toward law and peace on an international scale in mid August of 1946? There are disturbing situations in China where civil war continues, in Palestine where the Arabs and Jews contend with each other and the British, in Germany where the four occupying armies do not always keep harmony, in Trieste where the Jugoslavs and Russians line up against the Italians supported by other allied nations, in Iran, etc. The list of trouble spots in the world at present is a long one and could easily develop a number of circumstances which would lead to a disastrous war.

It has been fifteen months since war officially ended in Europe and twelve months since the Asiatic fighting stopped. What progress has been made toward a lasting peace? For one thing, the United Nations Charter has been ratified by more than 50 nations of the world and its machinery has been erected and set in motion. To the outsider, the results obtained by the United Nations agencies have seemed ineffective and there is reason to believe that several glaring weaknesses will need to be remedied. Let us remind those persons who point to the collapse of the League of Nations in predicting a similar fate for the United Nations, that the latter organization is a much larger combination of nations than its ill-fated predecessor. The machinery of the United Nations is far more elaborate than that of the League, and has been planned so as to eliminate weaknesses which developed in the previous organization. There seems no doubt that the United States will play a leading role in the United Nations future. This in itself is in direct contrast to our attitude toward the League of Nations. The other accomplishments of the United Nations in recent months have been the first meetings of the Assembly, the Security Council, and selection of

a permanent site for headquarters. It is significant that the site selected was located in the United States.

The Council for Foreign Ministers has held several meetings to iron out difficulties which have barred the way toward drawing up peace treaties with the defeated nations. At the time this article is being written, a Peace Conference is being held in Paris for the purpose of preparing peace treaties with Italy, Finland, Hungary, Romania, and Bulgaria. The Conference will make recommendations, with the final action on treaties to be taken later this fall by the Council of Foreign Ministers. There is every indication that it may take several years before peace treaties will be drafted with Germany and Japan. Foreign Minister Molotoff of Russia made a revealing statement on the German peace treaty problem in his report of July 10, 1946, a part of which is quoted below:

> We stand in principle for the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany, but before concluding this treaty there should be set up a single German government sufficiently democratic to be able to extirpate all remnants of fascism in Germany and sufficiently responsible to be able to fulfill all its obligations toward the Allies, including and more particularly those in respect to reparation deliveries to the Allies. . .But even when a German government has been set up it will take a number of years to check upon what this new German government represents and whether it is trustworthy.

We find no hint at present of any plan for a peace treaty with Japan in the near future. It is probable, however, that Austria will be taken into consideration before the more complicated German treaty is discussed. Until peace treaties are drafted and ratified by the natons concerned, the Allied armies of occupation will be continued in the defeated countries. Large areas of Europe will, therefore, be under the mlitary control of victorious armies for several more years.

No discussion of future peace in the world can ignore the atomic bomb, with its companion instruments of destruction, the rocket projectiles and radio-guided missiles. There are many persons who believe that the mere presence of such deadly weapons is a positive guarantee that wars will never again be fought. This line of reasoning is not without considerable foundation, at least until the major military nations have devised defensive protection against these new offensive threats. Up to the present, the atomic bomb is the exclusive property of the United States, Great Britain, and Canada. We may be certain, however, that other free nations are doing everything within their power to develop the scientific resources which will give them access to these new weapons. It is fortunate for the rest of the world today that the United States and the British Empire are not under the control of unscrupulous leaders with ambitions for conquest. The possibility that such a circumstance might arise in some part of the world at a future date is one of the strongest arguments for universal cooperation in the machinery of the United Nations.

The main conflict between nations during the postwar period has been between Soviet Russia and the democratic bloc composed of France, Great

Britain, and the United States. Every meeting of leaders in the Council of Foreign Ministers, or United Nations groups has been featured by clashes between the two groups. These disputes have been so numerous and complex that it would be futile to attempt any discussion in this article. The American public should not be hasty in condemning the Russian leaders, although it must be admitted that their policies are at variance with our own in certain respects. We must take time to study the history of Russia, the development of their present system of government, and the international relations between Russia and other countries in order to understand their actions. We must remind ourselves that as recently as July 2, 1946, the Soviet ambassador to the United States said that "there is no basis whatever for war" between the United States and Russia. Stalin himself made a similar statement not many months ago. We must assume, therefore, that the Russians are just as sincere in their desire for peace as we know our own country to be. Their policies, problems, and ambitions are different from ours, and they have different theories of government. There will be many bitter arguments between the United States and Russia over the drafting of peace treaties and the operations of the United Nations, but there is no positive evidence that such arguments must lead to war.

Senator Vandenberg, in his report to the Senate on July 17th made the following summary:

> Peace hangs chiefly upon three factors which are inextricably interwoven:
>
> One, the dependable and effective operation of the United Nations in behalf of justice courageously sustained by collective security.
> Two, the successful outlawry of atomic bombs and kindred instruments of sudden, overwhelming mass destruction, under a tight system of total discipline which makes bad faith impossible.
> Three, the development of dependable and warranted friendship between big and little nations; and particularly between the great Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the great United States of America.

The United States stands today as one of the chief guarantors of the United Nations, and must place full confidence in this method of settling disputes between nations. Defects in the organization must be eliminated, but the basic principles are sound. In all countries of the world the leaders in business, in the professions, and particularly those in government offices, must abandon the selfishness which has characterized the history of the world. The machinery for lasting peace is available. It remains for man to attain the greatness of character which will enable him to live in peace with his neighbor.